

**From:** Girish Vasvani  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/22/02 5:58pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

Hello,

My name is Girish Vasvani, am a software industry employee in California.

My resident address is ,

34144, Kasper Terrace,  
Fremont, CA-94555  
Ph : 510-742-1549

Over the past three years every federal court that has reviewed the Microsoft antitrust case has found that Microsoft repeatedly and aggressively violated U.S. antitrust laws and was liable for its illegal conduct.

The way Microsoft "Crushed" Netscape using it's Monopoly power is, pretty evident, and if Microsoft is not punished adequately for this, people in America will not trust Anti-trust Laws any more.

I don't agree to Proposed Final Judgement in Microsoft Settlement case for following reasons..

1. The PFJ does not End Microsoft's Monopoly and Even Allows Microsoft to expand its Monopoly into Other Technology Markets.

The deal fails to terminate the Microsoft monopoly, and instead guarantees Microsoft's monopoly will survive and be allowed to expand into new markets. Microsoft has always found it advantageous to leverage its operating system monopoly position in order to maximize its own profits, which many of us have experienced firsthand. In other words, to maximize profits (the goal of every public company), monopolists are almost forced to maximize the market power that their monopoly gives them. And this is why all monopolies must be carefully watched to make sure they

don't abuse their monopoly position. Indeed, many monopolies are either broken up or carefully regulated in order to protect the public interest. Why is Microsoft allowed a waiver to this general rule? Does the Justice Department think that Microsoft is going to suddenly change its operating methodology? The proposed deal with the justice department does not address the fact that Microsoft has abused its monopoly and is likely to do so again, and again, and again in the future to the detriment of others.

## 2. The PFJ Does Not Adequately Address Anticompetitive Behavior Identified by the Appeals Court.

Retaliation. The proposed settlement does not address Microsoft's proven ability to retaliate against would-be competitors and to, in effect, appropriate the intellectual property of its competitors ? and even its partners ? in fact all who do business with Microsoft. The Appeals court found such past conduct by Microsoft highly egregious yet the Agreement does not address these issues. Again, many of us have been on the receiving end of these types of Microsoft bullying tactics.

regards,  
Girish

CC: [microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw](mailto:microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw)